arXiv:1404.2961v3 [stat.ME] 17 May 2014

RATE OPTIMAL MULTIPLE TESTING PROCEDURE IN HIGH-DIMENSIONAL REGRESSION

By Pengsheng Ji[†] and Zhigen Zhao[‡*]

University of Georgia [†] *and Temple University*[‡]

Multiple testing and variable selection have gained much attention in statistical theory and methodology research. They are dealing with the same problem of identifying the important variables among many (Jin, 2012). However, there is little overlap in the literature. Research on variable selection has been focusing on selection consistency, i.e., both type I and type II errors converging to zero. This is only possible when the signals are sufficiently strong, contrary to many modern applications. For the regime where the signals are both rare and weak, it is inevitable that a certain amount of false discoveries will be allowed, as long as some error rate can be controlled. In this paper, motivated by the research by Ji and Jin (2012a) and Jin (2012) in the rare/weak regime, we extend their UPS procedure for variable selection to multiple testing. Under certain conditions, the new UPT procedure achieves the fastest convergence rate of marginal false non-discovery rates, while controlling the marginal false discovery rate at any designated level α asymptotically. Numerical results are provided to demonstrate the advantage of the proposed method.

1. Introduction. High-dimensional data analysis has become an increasingly active area of research in analyzing data from many modern scientific research areas. In this paper, we consider a setting in which there is one continuous response variable Y and p predictors for each subject, out of total n subjects (with p being much larger than n). We consider the following regression model

$$\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, \cdots, Y_n)^T$, $\boldsymbol{X} = (x_{ji})$, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$. In this formula, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ and $i = 1, 2, \cdots, p$ with x_{ji} being the value corresponding to the i-th predictor of the j-th subject. Let $\boldsymbol{X}_{j\cdot}$ (the j-th row of $\boldsymbol{X}$) be the values for the j-th subject; and $\boldsymbol{X}_{\cdot i}$, the i-th column of $\boldsymbol{X}$, be the value corresponding to the i-th predictor for all the subjects. In many

*Supported by the NSF Grant DMS-1208735.

Keywords and phrases: oracle property, selection consistency, testing optimality, convergence rate, marginal FDR/FNR, rare/weak model, loss function, Hamming distance, penalization methods

applications, it is known that the vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is sparse in the sense that the majority of the coordinates are zero. One objective in many scientific studies is to identify as many non-zeros as possible, subject to the controlling of the false positives.

For each predictor $X_{\cdot i}$, we want to test whether this predictor has a non-zero effect on the response $\boldsymbol{Y}$. This can be described by the following hypotheses:

$$H_i : \beta_i = 0, \ \ i = 1, 2, \cdots, p.$$

One wants to test these p hypotheses H_i's simultaneously and identify a set of hypotheses for rejection. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \cdots, \theta_p)$ where $\theta_i = 1(\beta_i \neq 0)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_p)$ be a decision based on the data. Here $\delta_i = 1$ if one decides to reject H_i; or, if not, $\delta_i = 0$.

1.1. *Connection with Variable Selection.* Ideally, one would like to reject all those hypotheses with $\theta_i = 1$ while accepting all the others with $\theta_i = 0$ with high probability, i.e.

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} P\left(\sum_i 1(\theta_i \neq \delta_i) = 0\right) \to 0. \tag{2}$$

This goal is known as the "selection consistency" or "oracle property" in the variable selection literature, and requires the signals are sufficiently strong. See, e.g., Fan and Li (2001), Zhao and Yu (2006), Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2006), Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2010), and Zou (2006).

However, in many modern applications(e.g., genomics), a large p means that signals are sparse or rare, and a small n usually means signals are weak. In the regime of rare and weak signals, which is the primary interest of this article, the conditions required for the selection consistency are, unfortunately, too strong to be true (Ji and Jin, 2012a; Zhang and Zhang, 2014). Therefore, it is scientifically more relevant to allow a certain number of false positives as long as a chosen type I error rate can be controlled at a pre-designated level (Jin, 2012). Such error rates include, but are not limited to, family wise error rate (FWER, Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2010)), false discovery rate (FDR, Benjamini and Hochberg (1995), Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001)), marginal false discovery rate (mFDR, Genovese and Wasserman (2002), Genovese and Wasserman (2004)), Bayesian false discovery rate (BFDR, Sarkar and Zhou (2008)), and many others. See Table 1 for the detailed definition. However, how to control these error rates remains very challenging, especially for high dimensional regression.

FDR	$E\frac{\sum_i (1-\theta_i)\delta_i}{\sum_i \delta_i}$	mFDR	$\frac{E\sum_i (1-\theta_i)\delta_i}{E\sum_i \delta_i}$
FNR	$E\frac{\sum_i \theta_i(1-\delta_i)}{\sum_i (1-\delta_i)}$	mFNR	$\frac{E\sum_i \theta_i(1-\delta_i)}{E\sum_i (1-\delta_i)}$
FWER	$P\left(\sum_i 1\left(\theta_i \neq \delta_i\right) \neq 0\right)$	BFDR	$E\left(E\frac{\sum_i (1-\theta_i)\delta_i}{\sum_i \delta_i}\right)$

TABLE 1

Definition of various error rates.

1.2. *Challenges in Multiple Testing.* The first challenge arises from the dependence among the variables. One simple solution is just ignoring the covariance structure, assuming the orthogonal design, and proceeding with the further analysis as usual. For instance, one can fit a simple linear regression model between $\boldsymbol{Y}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{\cdot i}$ and derive the usual test statistic t_i for the i-th hypothesis H_i (Fan, Han and Gu, 2012). Then one can apply the existing methods, such as the BH method, given in Benjamini and Hochberg (1995), which rejects the hypothesis H_i if $|t_i| > c$ for some threshold c.

Will this method provide a valid control of the false discovery rate? To illustrate this, consider the following simple example. Assume that $p = 1,000$, $n = 200$. Among all these 1,000 parameters, only $\lceil p^{1-0.5} \rceil = 32$ of them are nonzero. Among these non-zeros, half of them equal $\tau = \sqrt{2 \times 0.7 \times \log p}$ and half of them equal $-\tau$. Define the covariance matrix Ω as a block-diagonal matrix as

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & D & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & D \end{pmatrix}, \text{where } D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a \\ a & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

We then generate the design matrix $\boldsymbol{X}$ according to $\boldsymbol{X}'_{j\cdot} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \frac{1}{n}\Omega)$ and generate $\boldsymbol{Y}$ according to (1) with $\sigma = 1$. After calculating the t-statistics t_i's according to the marginal regression, we apply the BH method by setting $\alpha = 0.05$. For each simulation, we calculate the number of true positives, the number of false positives, and the false discovery proportion. We replicate this step 100 times to get the FDR, the average number of true positives (ATP), the average number of false positives (AFP), and mFDR. These numbers are reported in Table 2. It is shown that both the FDR and mFDR are inflated. The discrepancy of the actual levels to the pre-specified α can be as large as 39% when the correlation a is large. It is clearly seen that simply ignoring the covariance in high dimensional regression is problematic.

The second challenge arises from the power maximization. As seen from Table 2, one can increase the threshold c such that the mFDR can be controlled at α-level, but ATP will be too small. It is thus important to derive the

a	ATP	AFP	FDR	mFDR
0	3.86	0.31	0.06	0.07
0.3	3.92	0.40	0.07	0.09
0.5	3.94	0.72	0.09	0.15
0.7	3.89	1.51	0.21	0.28
0.9	4.74	3.72	0.38	0.44

TABLE 2

Simulation of the BH method, ignoring the dependence structure.

optimal testing procedure, which minimizes a certain form of type II errors, such as false non-discovery rate (FNR, Sarkar (2002)) or mFNR (Genovese and Wasserman (2004)), subject to the controlling of type I error.

The general idea for developing the optimal testing procedure is introduced in Sun and Cai (2007, 2009), and is further studied by Xie et al. (2011), He, Sarkar and Zhao (2013) and etc. Assume the independence, Sun and Cai (2007) introduced the compound decision theoretical framework which starts from the loss function of weighted sum of type I and type II errors,

$$L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda(1-\theta_i)\delta_i + \theta_i(1-\delta_i). \tag{4}$$

They have shown that the compound decision rule minimizing the risk is also optimal in terms of multiple testing. This result has further been generalized to the Markov dependence (Sun and Cai, 2009) and short range dependence (Xie et al., 2011). However, none of these methods can be applied to the regression model because these methods rely on the unknown quantity given in (7).

1.3. *Recent Advances in Variable Selection in the Rare/Weak Regime.* The study on the rare/weak regime goes back to Donoho and Jin (2004), and has been used in many other papers, such as Jager and Wellner (2007), Donoho and Jin (2008), Jin (2009), Hall and Jin (2008), Cands and Plan (2009), Ingster, Pouet and Tsybakov (2009), Hall and Jin (2010), Cai, Jin and Low (2007), Jin (2014), Jin and Ke (2014), etc. In this regime, the oracle property or selection consistency in (2) is no longer appropriate, even though technically it is much easier to deal with. Therefore, it is more realistic to use the Hamming distance as the loss function, as introduced to variable selection by Genovese et al. (2012).

Ji and Jin (2012a) and Genovese et al. (2012) initiate the study on variable selection in the rare/weak regime, even though the latter consider this problem only for the orthogonal design. For the first time, Ji and Jin (2012a)

show that the L^0 penalization is non-optimal and so all existing penelization methods are non-optimal. They also extend the phase diagram developed in Donoho and Jin (2004) to the settings of variable selection. Phase diagram is a notion first introduced in Donoho and Jin (2004), and then is further extended by many others.

In a recent discussion, Jin (2012) commented that the optimal variable selection and optimal multiple testing can be connected by using the decision theoretical framework. Any variable selection procedure that optimizes the risk associated with the loss function (4) is also optimal in multiple testing. Precisely, for a given λ, the optimal variable selection method can control the mFDR at $\alpha(\lambda)$ and achieve the optimal mFNR among all the testing procedures which controls mFDR at $\alpha(\lambda)$. However, the connection between $\alpha(\lambda)$ and λ is usually very complicated.

Philosophically, Jin (2012) provides new insight for using variable selection to do the multiple testing. However, there are two important questions to be answered. Firstly, for a given λ, how to develop the optimal testing method? Secondly, for a given α, how to choose λ or related parameters appropriately such that the mFDR is controlled at α asymptotically?

Ji and Jin (2012a) study the optimality of variable selection using the Hamming error, i.e., setting $\lambda = 1$ in the loss function (4). They show that the Univariate Penalization Screening (UPS) procedure achieves the optimal rate under certain conditions. Using this procedure naively for multiple testing makes the mFDR go to zero, but also substantially limits the power to discover signals.

1.4. *Our Contribution and Connection with Recent Literature.* In this article, assuming the regression model with rare and weak signals and certain weak dependence among variables, we first show that for any testing method which controls the mFDR at any given level α, there is a universal lower bound for the mFNR rate. Next, motivated by the UPS procedure for variable selection, we propose the Univariate Penalization for Testing (UPT) method. It turns out that this method achieves the optimal convergence rate in mFNR and controls mFDR at α level asymptotically. The aforementioned questions about the relationship between α and λ are also addressed. There are also critical differences in the proofs from the UPS since the control of the mFDR and the mFNR needs more delicate asymptotics and some different techniques.

The study on variable selection in the rare/weak regime initiated by Genovese et al. (2012) and Ji and Jin (2012a) has been extended to more general settings by a sequel of papers. Jin, Zhang and Zhang (2012) introduce the

Graphlet Screening method for strong dependence among variables; Ke, Jin and Fan (2012) propose the Covariance Assisted Screening and Estimation (CASE) procedure for non-sparse but sparsifiable Gram matrix, which is also discussed in Jin and Ke (2014). The problem of extending these methods to multiple testing remains largely open, can be even more challenging and so is left for future research.

1.5. *Contents and Notations.* The remaining sections are organized as follows. In Section 2, the rare/weak model is specified and the lower bound of the convergence rate of mFNR is given. The UPT method is proposed in Section 3 and the optimality results are provided. Some numerical studies in Section 4 demonstrate the performance of the UPT method. The proofs are left in Section 6.

We use a similar framework as Ji and Jin (2012a) and also adopt some similar notations for technical convenience.

2. The Rare/Weak Model and Lower Bound of mFNR. We assume the following regression model with rare and weak signals which is the same as that in Ji and Jin (2012a):

$$(5)\quad \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \epsilon \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_n); \\ \beta_i \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \pi_0 h_0 + \pi_1 h_1, \\ \text{where the point mass } h_0 \text{ at 0 has no common support with } h_1; \\ \tau_p = \sqrt{2r\log p}; \\ \pi_1 = p^{-\vartheta}. \end{cases}$$

Note that the support of the signal distribution h_1 has the order of $\sqrt{\log p}$, representing rare and weak signals; the proportion of signals π_1 goes to zero as p goes to infinity, indicating rare signals. This model (5) goes back to Donoho and Jin (2004) and has been used by Jager and Wellner (2007), Cands and Plan (2009), Ingster, Pouet and Tsybakov (2009) and many others.

In this section, we study the lower bound of the rate of the mFNR of any testing procedure which has mFDR being controlled at α level. Assume the loss function (4), then the oracle decision is given as

$$(6)\qquad \delta_i^{opt} = 1_{\{fdr_i(\boldsymbol{Y}) \le \frac{1}{1+\lambda}\}}.$$

where

$$(7)\qquad fdr_i(\boldsymbol{Y}) = P(\theta_i = 0|\boldsymbol{Y})$$

is the generalized local fdr (Efron, 2008, 2010; He, Sarkar and Zhao, 2013) for the i-th hypothesis, or local index of significance (Sun and Cai, 2009).

We first study the risk of the oracle decision rule (6).

THEOREM 2.1. *Assume Model (5) and the loss function (4). Then the risk of the oracle decision rule (6) is given as*

$$\sum_i E\left\{1_{\{fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})\le\frac{1}{1+\lambda}\}}\left[(\lambda+1)fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})-1\right]+\pi_1\right\}.$$

Theorem 2.1 is a general theorem that can actually be applied to much broader settings than Model (5). Before stating the next theorem about the rate of the risk, we will recall the definition of "multi-log" term introduced in Ji and Jin (2012a).

DEFINITION 2.1. *The term $L_p > 0$ is a multi-log(p) term if for any constant $\varkappa > 0$,*

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} L_p p^{\varkappa} = \infty, \quad \lim_{p\to\infty} L_p p^{-\varkappa} = 0,$$

THEOREM 2.2. *Assume Model (5) with the following conditions*

$$\boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{X} \quad \textit{has unit diagonals,} \tag{8}$$

and

$$h_1 \quad \textit{is supported within } [-\tau_p, 0)\cup(0,\tau_p]. \tag{9}$$

Then, for any decision rule $\boldsymbol{\delta}$,

$$Risk(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \ge \sum_i \left[\lambda\pi_0\bar{\Phi}(\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}+\frac{\tau_p}{2}) + \pi_1\Phi(\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}-\frac{\tau_p}{2})\right]. \tag{10}$$

Let $\lambda = p^{-\zeta}$, where $\vartheta - r < \zeta < \vartheta + r$. Then

$$\frac{Risk(\boldsymbol{\delta})}{p} \ge L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}, \tag{11}$$

where L_p is a multi-log(p) term.

When setting $\zeta = 0$, this result reduces to Theorem 1.1 in Ji and Jin (2012a). Theorem 2.2 provides a bound for the weighted sum of type I and type II errors. We now turn to the study of mFDR and mFNR.

THEOREM 2.3. *Assume Model (5) with conditions (8) and (9). Let* $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ *be any testing procedure such that* $m\text{FDR} \leq \alpha(1+o(1))$ *for a given* α*. If* ζ *satisfies* $\vartheta - r < \zeta < \vartheta + r$*, then*

$$p^{-\vartheta-\zeta} m\text{FDR} + m\text{FNR} \;\geq\; L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}},$$

where L_p *is a multi-log(p) term.*

The above theorem provides a bound for the weighted sum of the mFDR and the mFNR, and also sheds light on the connection with the weighted classification error as in Theorem 2.2. In practice, one usually wants to control the mFDR at a certain level α, rather than making the mFDR very small but sacrificing the power to discover new signals as the UPS does. The following theorem demonstrates that mFNR can not converge to zero too fast.

THEOREM 2.4. *In Model (5) with conditions (8) and (9), for any testing procedure with* $m\text{FDR} \leq \alpha$*,* $0 < \alpha < 1$*, and for any given* $\varkappa > 0$*, the* $m\text{FNR}$ *of this procedure satisfies*

$$m\text{FNR} \geq L_p p^{-[\vartheta+(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2]-\varkappa}.$$

Note the information about $\boldsymbol{X}$ has been absorbed. This theorem indicates that $L_p p^{-[\vartheta+(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2]}$ is essentially the lower bound for mFNR up to an arbitrarily small penalty.

Under the orthogonal design, it can be shown that $m\text{FDR}$ of any procedure converges to 1 when $r < \vartheta$. We will, therefore, only focus on the case when $r > \vartheta$ for the rest of the paper. When setting $\lambda = 1$, it is shown in Ji and Jin (2012a) that for the oracle decision rule,

$$m\text{FNR} \;\approx \frac{\sum_i \theta_i(1-\delta_i)}{p} \geq L_p p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta)^2}{4r}}.$$

It is easily shown that

$$\vartheta + (\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2 > \frac{(r+\vartheta)^2}{4r}.$$

This implies that it is possible to improve the convergence rate of the mFNR when assigning less weight to false discoveries. In other words, assigning less penalty on type I error can increase the power in detecting true alternatives. This is beneficial especially in models with rare signals.

3. The UPT Method and Upper Bound. Previously, we have derived the lower bound of mFNR under Model (5) for any procedure which can control mFDR at a given level. In this section, motivated by the UPS procedure for variable selection, we will provide a UPT procedure, short for Univariate Penalization for Testing. Under certain conditions, this method can control mFDR at α level asymptotically and achieve the optimal convergence rate in mFNR.

Let $\hat{\Omega}^* = \boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ be a matrix such that $\hat{\Omega}_{j,k} = \hat{\Omega}^*_{j,k} \cdot 1\{|\hat{\Omega}^*_{j,k}| > \log^{-2}(p)\}$. View $\hat{\Omega}$ as a graph with p node, corresponding to p predictors. Two nodes i and j are connected if and only $\hat{\Omega}_{i,j} \neq 0$. The UPT method can be summarized as the following steps.

1. Calculating the marginal correlation $(\boldsymbol{x}_{\cdot i}, \boldsymbol{Y})$ and keep those predictor with $|(\boldsymbol{x}_{\cdot i}, \boldsymbol{y}) > t_1$ where $t_1 = \sqrt{2q \log p}$. Denote this set as $\mathcal{U}_p$, also viewed as a graph induced from $\hat{\Omega}$;
2. Decompose $\mathcal{U}_p$ into small subgraphs;
3. For each subgraph $\mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p$, find the estimator for $\mu_{\mathcal{I}_0}$ to maximize (12)
$$\frac{1}{2}\left[(\boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{Y})^{\mathcal{I}_0} - (\boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{X})^{\mathcal{I}_0}\mu\right]' \left((\boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{X})^{\mathcal{I}_0,\mathcal{I}_0}\right)^{-1} \left[(\boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{Y})^{\mathcal{I}_0} - (\boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{X})^{\mathcal{I}_0}\mu\right] + t_2^2||\mu||_{\mathcal{I}_0},$$
subject to a constraint that each coordinate in $\mu_{\mathcal{I}_0}$ is either 0 or t_3.

The difference between the UPT method and the UPS is the choice of (t_1, t_2, t_3). For the UPS, (t_1, t_2, t_3) are chosen to balance the type I error and type II error with equal weights. When considering the testing, there are different weights associated with these two errors, reflected by the choice of α, the mFDR level. Deriving the parameters such that mFDR is controlled at α level asymptotically turns out to be challenging. We will give details in the rest of this section in how to choose these parameters.

We consider the same conditions about the model as in Ji and Jin (2012a) and restate these conditions in order to better present our result. Assume that

$$\boldsymbol{X}'_{j\cdot} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \frac{1}{n}\Omega) \tag{13}$$

The conditions for Ω are summarized as following. Fixing $A > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, let

$$\mathcal{M}^*_p(\gamma, A) = \{\Omega : \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\Omega(i,j)|^\gamma \leq A, \forall 1 \leq i \leq p\}.$$

For any $\Omega \in \mathcal{M}^*_p$, let U be the upper part of Ω and $d(\Omega) = \max\{||U(\Omega)||_1, ||U(\Omega)||_\infty\}$.

Fixing $\omega_0 \in (0, 1/2)$, we consider the following set of correlation matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_p = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{M}_p^*(\gamma, A) : d(\Omega) \le \omega_0\}. \tag{14}$$

In our study, we also assume that

$$n = n_p = p^{\varphi}, \text{ with } 1 - \vartheta < \varphi < 1, \tag{15}$$

which is almost necessary for successful variable selection (Donoho, 2006). Suppose that the support of signal distribution h_1 is contained in

$$[\tau_p, (1+\eta)\eta_p], \tag{16}$$

where η is defined as

$$\eta = \frac{\vartheta r}{(\vartheta + r)\sqrt{1+2\omega_0}} \min\{\frac{2\vartheta}{r}, 1 - \frac{\vartheta}{r}, \sqrt{2(1-\omega_0)} - 1 + \frac{\vartheta}{r}\}.$$

We start with the case where the parameters (r, ϑ) are known. The interplay of the rare/weak signals and the graph sparsity results in the following two lemmas which are crucial for the development of the theoretical property of the UPT method.

LEMMA 3.1. *Assume Model (5) and conditions (13)–(16). If* $0 < q \le \frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}$, *then*

$$\frac{1}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p} P(\boldsymbol{x}_{j\cdot}'\boldsymbol{Y} < t_1, \beta_j \neq 0) \le O(\frac{1}{\log(p)}) p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

The idea of marginal screening gained much attention in recent years (Fan and Lv, 2008; Ji and Jin, 2012a; Li, Zhong and Zhu, 2012). When the signals are sparse, screening can reduce the dimension from p to a much smaller scale and thus greatly reduce the complexity of the problem. People usually require the SURE property (Fan and Lv, 2008), which says that all the important predictors are kept with the probability converging to one. For the rare and weak signals, it is more appropriate to consider *Tolerable Screening* which allows type II error as long as these errors due to the screening step is tolerable. Tolerable screening is firstly explored in Ji and Jin (2012a) but called Sure Screening therein.

LEMMA 3.2. *Assume Model (5) and conditions (13)–(16). As* $p \to \infty$, *there is a constant* K *such that with probability* $1 - o(p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}})$, *each component of* $\mathcal{U}_p$ *has no more than* K *nodes.*

The proof this lemma is very similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4 in Ji and Jin (2012b) and is thus omitted. This property is known as Separable After Screening (SAS) property in Ji and Jin (2012a). Then after screening, the graph of variables defined by the regularized Gram matrix is automatically broken into small pieces. The interplay of the signal sparsity and the graph sparsity continue to be the key for a successful cleaning step as described earlier in this section. We are now ready to state the results for the upper bounds of mFDR and mFNR.

THEOREM 3.1. *Assume Model (5) and conditions (13)–(16). Set* $t_1 = \sqrt{2q\log(p)}$, $t_2 = \sqrt{2(\vartheta-\zeta)\log(p)}$, $t_3 = \sqrt{2r\log(p)}$, *where* ϑ *and* q *are chosen such that* $(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2 \geq 4\vartheta r$ *and* $0 < q \leq \frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}$. *Then the* mFDR *of the UPT method satisfies*

$$\text{mFDR} \ \leq L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2-2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}},$$

and the mFNR *satisfies*

$$\text{mFNR} \ \leq L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

The parameter t_3, relating to the signal strength, is the same as that in the UPS. The parameters t_1 and t_2 depends on λ via ζ. For any $0 \leq \psi < r-\vartheta$, one can choose $\zeta = r+\vartheta-2\sqrt{r(\vartheta+\psi)}$ so that mFDR converges to zero in the order of $p^{-\psi}$. Especially, if we choose $\zeta = (\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2$, the mFDR is controlled by a single L_p term. However, this is not enough because in testing literature, one usually wants to control the constant at α level, asymptotically. Therefore, the crucial parameter t_2 requires higher order term.

THEOREM 3.2. *Assume Model (5) and conditions (13)–(16). For any* $\alpha > 0$, *let* t_1 *and* t_3 *be the same as in Theorem 3.1 and*

$$t_2^* = \sqrt{2(\vartheta-\zeta)\log p + \frac{4r}{r+\vartheta-\zeta}\cdot\Big[(K-\frac{1}{2})\log\log p - \log M\Big]}, \tag{17}$$

where $\zeta = (\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2$, K *is a sufficiently large constant,*

$$M = \frac{\alpha\sqrt{\pi}(r+\vartheta-\zeta)}{(2e)^K\sqrt{r}(1-\alpha)}.$$

Then

$$\text{mFDR} \ \leq \alpha(1+o(1)) \quad \textit{and} \quad \text{mFNR} \ \leq L_p p^{-\vartheta+(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2}.$$

Similar to the UPS method, the key parameters (t_1, t_2, t_3) can be estimated using the data. Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \boldsymbol{X}'\boldsymbol{Y}$. Denote the largest off-diagonal coordinate of Ω by $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\Omega) = \max_{\{1\le i,j\le p, i\ne j\}} |\Omega(i,j)|$. Fix q such that $\max\{\delta_0^2(1+\eta)^2 r, \vartheta - \zeta\} < q \le \frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}$ and $t_1 = \sqrt{2q\log p}$. Define two estimates of ϑ and r as

$$\text{(18)} \quad \begin{cases} \hat{\vartheta} = \frac{-2log(\bar{F}_p(t_1))}{2\log p}, \\ \hat{r} = \frac{(\mu_p(t_1)/\bar{F}_p(t_1))^2}{2\log p}, \text{where } \mu_p(t_1) = \frac{1}{p}\sum_j \tilde{Y}_j \cdot 1(\tilde{Y}_j > t). \end{cases}$$

THEOREM 3.3. *Assume the same condition in Theorem 3.2 and the mean of* $h(\beta)_i \le \tau_p(1+o(1))$. *Fix* q *such that* $\max\{\delta_0^2(1+\eta)^2 r, \vartheta - (\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2\} < q \le \vartheta$ *and* $t_1 = \sqrt{2q\log p}$. *Estimate* t_2^* *in (17) by* $\hat{t}_2^*$ *using* $\hat{\vartheta}$ *and* $\hat{r}$ *from (18), and let* $\hat{t}_3 = \sqrt{2\hat{r}\log p}$. *Then*

$$m\text{FDR} \le \alpha(1+o(1)) \quad \textit{and} \quad m\text{FNR} \le L_p p^{-\vartheta+(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2}.$$

In other words, the UPT method achieves the optimal convergence rate in mFNR, subject to the controlling of mFDR at any designated level α.

The UPT method depends on two parameters K and q. Choosing a sufficiently large K can guarantee the controlling of mFDR and will not reduce the convergence rate of mFNR. We recommend using the maximal component size after thresholding the Gram matrix $X'X$. Similar to the UPS (Ji and Jin, 2012a), both theory and simulation studies show the procedure allows some flexibility in the choice of q. Running the screening step or even iterating the entire procedure a few times is recommended for best performance.

4. Simulation. We have conducted a few numerical experiments to compare the performance of the UPT method, the BH method and the BY method (Benjamini and Yekutieli, 2001)for some configurations of $(\vartheta, \theta, \pi_p, \Omega)$. The mFDR level we tried to control is 0.05. The experiments contain the following steps:

(1) Generate a $p\times 1$ vector β by $\beta_j \overset{iid}{\sim} (1-\epsilon_p)\nu_0 + \epsilon_p\pi_p$. The distribution π_p is taken as a uniform distribution centered at τ_p, and then is assigned a random sign.
(2) Generate an $n_p \times p$ matrix X, the rows of which are samples from $N(0, \frac{1}{n_p}\Omega)$; generate a $n_p \times 1$ vector $z \sim N(0, I_{n_p})$; let $Y = X\beta + z$.
(3) Apply the UPT method procedure and the BH method and the BY method. First, we run the UPT method with the ideal tuning parameters (UPT* method) and the estimated tuning parameters (UPT

method). We choose $K = 5$ if it is needed. Second, we fit a simple linear regression between Y and X_i and obtain the usual test statistic t_i and P-value p_i and apply the BH method and the BY method respectively.

(4) Repeat (2)–(3) for 100 independent cycles, and calculate the average number of true positives (ATP), the average number of false positives (AFP) and the false discovery rate (FDR).

Experiment 1. In this experiment, we choose $p = 5000$ and $n = 1000$, and Ω as the block diagonal matrix in (3) with $a = 0.5$. Let $\vartheta = .5$, and π_p as the point mass at τ which vary from 2 to 8. There are approximately 70 signals, and each is given a random sign. The ATP, AFP, and FDR for each procedure are listed in Table 3.

τ_p	2			4			6			8		
	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR
BH	0.55	0.05	0.08	11.20	0.95	0.08	23.20	2.85	0.11	32.45	5.25	0.14
BY	0.10	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.05	0.02	7.60	0.20	0.03	12.95	0.35	0.03
UPT*	1.17	0.10	0.08	16.54	1.02	0.06	27.98	1.43	0.05	37.51	2.58	0.06
UPT	1.15	0.09	0.08	14.97	1.04	0.06	26.34	1.56	0.06	34.32	2.64	0.06

TABLE 3

Experiment 1: Comparison for the Block Diagonal Ω

Experiment 2. We keep all the parameters as in Experiment 1 but add some random perturbations from Uniform$[-0.5, 0.5]$ to the signals, and take Ω as the penta-diagonal matrix $\Omega(i,j) = 1\{i = j\} + 0.5 \cdot 1\{|i-j| = 1\} + 0.1 \cdot 1\{|i-j| = 2\}$. The results for each procedure are shown in Table 4.

τ_p	2			4			6			8		
	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR
BH	0.50	0.05	0.09	10.90	1.55	0.12	23.75	4.05	0.15	31.95	8.00	0.20
BY	0.10	0.00	0.00	3.60	0.25	0.06	6.50	0.20	0.03	12.55	1.05	0.08
UPT*	1.15	0.08	0.07	14.95	0.91	0.06	26.85	1.46	0.05	36.89	2.09	0.06
UPT	1.17	0.09	0.07	13.87	0.84	0.06	26.16	1.51	0.06	33.72	2.59	0.07

TABLE 4

Experiment 2: Comparison for the Penta-diagonal Ω

Experiment 3. We keep all the parameters as in Experiment 2, but consider the UPT method only with a few choices for the tuning parameter t_1, indicated by a factor from 1.10 to 0.90. The results in Table 5 show that the UPT* method with non-ideal tuning parameters can still outperform the BH and BY methods in Experiment 2, and the procedure itself is not very sensitive to the choice of the threshold. Therefore, in practice, we may try a few values for this threshold or do some kind of iteration.

τ_p	2			4			6			8		
	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR
1.10	0.57	0.05	0.08	12.31	0.82	0.06	23.48	1.31	0.06	31.40	1.47	0.05
1.05	0.92	0.07	0.07	13.26	0.87	0.06	25.69	1.41	0.06	34.49	1.86	0.06
1.00	1.15	0.08	0.07	14.95	0.91	0.06	26.85	1.46	0.05	36.89	2.09	0.06
0.95	1.18	0.09	0.07	15.36	0.98	0.06	27.81	1.72	0.07	37.12	2.56	0.07
0.90	1.20	0.09	0.07	15.96	1.15	0.07	29.56	2.77	0.07	40.87	2.81	0.06

TABLE 5

Experiment 3: Results of the UPT method with Different Tuning Parameters.*

Experiment 4. We keep all the parameters as in Experiment 2. We use a non-Gaussian design for X. In detail, we generate an $n \times p$ matrix M, the coordinates of which are iid samples from Uniform$(-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3})$. Second, generate Ω as in Experiment 2. Last, let $X = (1/\sqrt{n})M\Omega^{1/2}$. The results in 6 suggest that the procedure works for more general designs.

τ_p	2			4			6			8		
	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR
BH	0.54	0.04	0.07	10.84	1.15	0.10	24.54	3.95	0.14	31.48	7.64	0.20
BY	0.09	0.06	0.04	3.52	0.27	0.07	7.35	0.44	0.06	13.58	1.42	0.09
UPT*	1.17	0.09	0.07	15.63	1.09	0.07	26.81	1.53	0.05	37.15	2.19	0.06
UPT	1.12	0.08	0.07	14.84	0.97	0.06	26.45	1.46	0.05	35.12	2.37	0.06

TABLE 6

Experiment 4: Results for Non-Gaussian Design

In Experiments 1, 2, and 4, the proposed UPT method, controls the mFDR at the α-level well; however, its competitor, the BH method, fails to do so. The mFDR of BH can be as large as 20%. The UPT method generally has a larger ATP and a smaller AFP than BH method. For instance, when $\tau_p = 8$ in Experiment 4, the ATP of the UPT method is 4 more than that of BH method. This number is significant given that the signals are rare and weak. In all the settings, the BY method is too conservative in terms of controlling the mFDR and the ATP is too low.

In these three experiments, the UPT method has smaller mFDR than that of the BH method. We expect to discover even more true positives if we set the mFDR the same. This is done in the next experiment where we keep the setting in Experiment 4 but adjust the nominal mFDR level of the UPT method such that the empirical mFDR of the UPT method is the same as that of BH method. The difference of ATP for these two methods becomes more significant.

Experiment 5. We keep all the settings in Experiment 4 but adjust the nominal mFDR level of the UPT* and UPT such that the observed mFDR is the same as that of the BH method. The ATP and AFP are shown in Table

7. It is shown that both the UPT* and the UPT discover significantly more signals than the BH method.

τ_p	2			4			6			8		
	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR	ATP	AFP	mFDR
BH	0.54	0.04	0.07	10.84	1.15	0.10	24.54	3.95	0.14	31.48	7.64	0.20
UPT*	1.17	0.09	0.07	16.38	1.82	0.10	32.31	5.26	0.14	47.24	11.81	0.20
UPT	1.12	0.08	0.07	15.76	1.75	0.10	30.77	5.01	0.14	41.40	10.35	0.20

TABLE 7

Experiment 5: Results for Non-Gaussian Design for the Same Observed mFDR

In summary, the UPT method controls the mFDR well and is more powerful in identifying the true positives. We therefore strongly recommend it for testing the hypotheses in the high-dimensional regression models.

5. Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful for helpful comments and discussions with Dr. Jiashun Jin.

6. Appendix. Proof of Theorem 2.1:

$$\begin{aligned} & EL(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\delta})|\boldsymbol{y} \\ = & \sum_i \{\lambda\delta_i fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}) + (1-\delta_i)(1-fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}))\} \\ = & \sum_i \{(1-fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})) + \delta_i((\lambda+1)fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})-1)\} \\ = & \sum_i (1-fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})) + \sum_i 1_{\{fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})\le\frac{1}{\lambda+1}\}}\left((\lambda+1)fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})-1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Take the expectation on both sides. Since $E(1-fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})) = \pi_1$,

$$Risk = \sum_i E\left\{1_{\{fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})\le\frac{1}{1+\lambda}\}}((\lambda+1)fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})-1)+\pi_1\right\}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.2: Let $f_0^i(\boldsymbol{y})$ and $f_1^i(\boldsymbol{y})$ be the density function of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ under $\theta_i = 0$ and $\theta_i = 1$. The marginal density of $\boldsymbol{y}$ is given as

$$f(\boldsymbol{y}) = \pi_0 f_0^i(\boldsymbol{y}) + \pi_1 f_1^i(\boldsymbol{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = P(\theta_i = 0|\boldsymbol{y}) = \frac{\pi_0 f_0^i(\boldsymbol{y})}{f(\boldsymbol{y})}. \tag{19}$$

Let $\mathcal{R}_i = \{y : fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}) \le \frac{1}{1+\lambda}\}$. Then

$$E1_{\{fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})\le\frac{1}{1+\lambda}\}} fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = \int_{\mathcal{R}_i} fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}) f(\boldsymbol{y}) d\boldsymbol{y} = \int_{\mathcal{R}_i} \pi_0 f_0^i(\boldsymbol{y}) d\boldsymbol{y}. \tag{20}$$

Similarly,

$$E1_{\{fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})\le\frac{1}{1+\lambda}\}}(1-fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}))=\int_{\mathcal{R}_i}\pi_1 f_1^i(\boldsymbol{y})d\boldsymbol{y}. \tag{21}$$

Note that $Risk=EL(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\delta})=E(EL(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\delta})|\boldsymbol{y})$ where $EL(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\delta})|\boldsymbol{y}$ can be written as

$$\lambda\delta_i fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y})+(1-fdr_i(\boldsymbol{y}))(1-\delta_i).$$

Then

$$Risk=\lambda\int_{\mathcal{R}_i}\pi_0 f_0^i(\boldsymbol{y})d\boldsymbol{y}+\int_{\mathcal{R}_i^c}\pi_1 f_1^i(\boldsymbol{y})d\boldsymbol{y}.$$

The remaining of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Ji and Jin (2012b). The difference is that we consider the parameter λ, which plays a key role in developing the theory regarding the mFDR and mFNR. We only sketch the steps of the proof here. Firstly, we can show that

$$Risk=\sum_i\left[\frac{\lambda\pi_0+\pi_1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\int|\lambda\pi_0 f_0^i(\boldsymbol{y})-\pi_1 f_1^i(\boldsymbol{y})|d\boldsymbol{y}.\right]$$

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i=\boldsymbol{\beta}-\beta_i e_i$ where $e_i=(0,\cdots,0,1,0,\cdots,0)^T$ is a unit vector with all zero entries except the i-th coordinate. Let $h(y,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\beta_i)$ be the joint density of $\boldsymbol{Y}\sim N(\boldsymbol{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i+\beta_i e_i),\mathbf{I}_n)$. Let $H(\beta_i)$ and $H(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i)$ are the cdf of β_i and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i$ respectively. Mimic the proof in Ji and Jin (2012b), we know that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int|\lambda\pi_0 f_0^i(\boldsymbol{y})-\pi_1 f_1^i(\boldsymbol{y})|d\boldsymbol{y}\\ \le\ &\int\int\int M(\lambda,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\beta_i)d\boldsymbol{y}dH(\beta_i)dH(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i),\end{aligned}$$

where $M(\lambda,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\beta_i)=\int|\lambda\pi_0 h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,0)-\pi_1 h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\beta}_i,\beta_i)|d\boldsymbol{y}$. It is easily seen that $M(\lambda,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,-\beta_i)=M(\lambda,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\beta_i)$ and this function is increasing with respect to β_i for $\beta_i>0$. Consequently,

$$Risk\ge\sum_i\left[\frac{\lambda\pi_0+\pi_1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\int M(\lambda,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\tau_p)dH(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i).\right] \tag{22}$$

Let $D=\{y:\pi_1 h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\tau_p)>\lambda\pi_0 h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,0)\}=\{y:\pi_1\exp(\tau_p x_i'(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i)-\tau_p^2/2)>\lambda\pi_0\}$. Then

$$\frac{\lambda\pi_0+\pi_1}{2}-\frac{M(\lambda,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\tau_p)}{2}=\lambda\pi_0\int_D h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,0)d\boldsymbol{y}+\pi_1\int_{D^c}h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\tau_p)d\boldsymbol{y}.$$

Using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Ji and Jin (2012b), we know that

(23)
$$\int_D h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,0)d\boldsymbol{y}=\bar{\Phi}(\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}+\frac{\tau_p}{2}),\ \int_D^c h(\boldsymbol{y},\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i,\tau_p)d\boldsymbol{y}=\Phi(\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}-\frac{\tau_p}{2}).$$

Combining (22) and (23), we can establish (10). Next, we will prove (11). Note that $\lambda=p^{-\zeta},\pi_1=p^{-\vartheta}$,

$$\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}+\frac{\tau_p}{2}=\frac{\sqrt{2}(r+(\theta-\zeta))}{2\sqrt{r}}\sqrt{\log p}+\log L_p,$$

and

$$\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}-\frac{\tau_p}{2}=-\frac{\sqrt{2}(r-(\theta-\zeta))}{2\sqrt{r}}\sqrt{\log p}+\log L_p,$$

Note that $r>\theta-\zeta$. According to Mills' ratio

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda\pi_0\bar{\Phi}(\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}+\frac{\tau_p}{2})+\pi_1\Phi(\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}-\frac{\tau_p}{2})\\
=\ & L_pp^{-\zeta}\pi_0\phi(\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}+\frac{\tau_p}{2})+L_p\pi_1\phi((\log(\frac{\lambda\pi_0}{\pi_1})\frac{1}{\tau_p}-\frac{\tau_p}{2}))\\
=\ & L_pp^{-\zeta}p^{-\frac{(r+(\vartheta-\zeta))^2}{4r}}+L_pp^{-\vartheta}p^{-\frac{(r-(\theta-\zeta))^2}{4r}}=L_pp^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}},
\end{aligned}$$

because

$$\zeta+\frac{(r+(\vartheta-\zeta))^2}{4r}=\vartheta+\frac{(r-(\vartheta-\zeta))^2}{4r}=\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.3

Without loss of generality, we only need to consider the following three cases:

(1) there exist two multi-log terms C_1 and C_2 such that
$$C_1\le\frac{E\sum_i\delta_i}{p^{1-\vartheta}}\le C_2;$$
(2) there exists $K_1>0$ such that $\frac{E\sum_i\delta_i}{p^{1-\vartheta}}=o(p^{-K_1})$;
(3) there exists $K_2>0$ such that $\frac{E\sum_i\delta_i}{p^{1-\vartheta}}\gtrapprox p^{K_2}$.

If case (3) holds, then

$$m\text{FDR}=\frac{E\sum_i(1-\theta_i)\delta_i}{E\sum_i\delta_i}=1+o(1).$$

This contradicts the assumption that $m\text{FDR} \le \alpha(1+o(1))$. Consequently, we only focus on case (1) and (2).

In case (1), by Theorem 1.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & p^{-\vartheta-\zeta} m\text{FDR} \ + m\text{FNR} \\ = \ & p^{-\vartheta-\zeta} \frac{E\sum_i (1-\theta_i)\delta_i}{E\sum_i \delta_i} + \frac{E\sum_i \theta_i(1-\delta_i)}{E\sum_i (1-\delta_i)} \\ \gtrapprox \ & \frac{1}{p}(L_p p^{-\zeta} E\sum_i (1-\theta_i)\delta_i + E\sum_i \theta_i(1-\delta_i)) \\ \ge \ & L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}. \end{aligned}$$

In case (2),

$$m\text{FNR} = \frac{E\sum_i \theta_i(1-\delta_i)}{E\sum_i (1-\delta_i)} \gtrapprox \frac{p^{1-\vartheta}}{p} = p^{-\vartheta}.$$

Then

$$p^{\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}(p^{-\vartheta-\zeta} m\text{FDR} \ + m\text{FNR} \ ) \ge p^{\frac{(r+\zeta-\vartheta)^2}{4r}} \ge L_p.$$

This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 2.4:

For any sufficiently small $\varkappa > 0$, let

$$\varkappa' = \vartheta - \left[\sqrt{r} - \sqrt{(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2 + \varkappa}\right]^2 > 0.$$

Consequently,

$$(\sqrt{r} - \sqrt{\vartheta - \varkappa'})^2 = (\sqrt{r} - \sqrt{\vartheta})^2 + \varkappa.$$

Let $\zeta = r + \vartheta - 2\sqrt{r(\vartheta - \varkappa')}$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{r^2 + (\vartheta-\zeta)^2 + 2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r} - \vartheta - \zeta \\ = \ & \frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2 - 4r\vartheta}{4r} = \frac{4r(\vartheta-\varkappa') - 4r\vartheta}{4r} \\ = \ & -\varkappa'. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$p^{\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r} - \vartheta - \zeta} m\text{FDR} = O(p^{-\varkappa'}).$$

According to Theorem 2.3,

$$p^{\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}} m_{\mathrm{FNR}} \geq L_p. \tag{24}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r} \\ = \ & \frac{(\zeta-\vartheta+r)^2+4r\vartheta}{4r} = \frac{\left[2\sqrt{r}(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta-\varkappa'})\right]^2+4r\vartheta}{4r} \\ = \ & (\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta-\varkappa'})^2+\vartheta = \vartheta+(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2+\varkappa. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with equation (24), we know that

$$m_{\mathrm{FNR}} \geq L_p p^{-\left[\vartheta+(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2\right]-\varkappa}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.1:
According to the proof of Lemma 2.1 in Ji and Jin (2012b), with probability of $1+o(1/p^D)$ where D is a sufficiently large constant,

$$P(x_j'Y < t, \theta_j = 1) \leq p^{-\vartheta}\Phi(t-\tau_p).$$

According to Mill's ratio, the right hand side can be simplified as $L_p p^{-\vartheta-(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{q})^2}$ which is smaller than or equal to $L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}$ because $0 < q \leq \frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}$. □

In order to prove Theorem 3.1, we need the following lemma.

LEMMA 6.1. *Assume Model (5) and conditions (13)–(16). Set* $t_1 = \sqrt{2q\log(p)}$, $t_2 = \sqrt{2(\vartheta-\zeta)\log(p)}$, $t_3 = \sqrt{2r\log(p)}$ *for the UPT method, then the weighted classification error associated with the loss function (4) where* $\lambda = L_p p^{-\zeta}$ *is given as*

$$\frac{Risk}{p} \leq L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Define the event A_p as

$$\begin{aligned} A_p \ = \ & \{|(X'X)(i,j)-\Omega(i,j)| \leq L_p p^{-\omega/2}, \forall 1 \leq i,j \leq n\} \\ \cap \ & \{||(X'X)^{\mathcal{I}_0,\mathcal{I}_0}-\Omega^{\mathcal{I}_0,\mathcal{I}_0}||_\infty \leq L_p p^{-\omega/2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to Ji and Jin (2012b), $P(A_p) = 1-o(1/p^D)$ where D is a sufficiently large constant. Consequently, we only need to show the result when $X \in A_p$.

Now, the risk can be naturally written as two parts $Risk = I + II$ where

$$I = \sum_i E(L(\theta_i, \delta_i)1(i \notin \mathcal{U}_p(t))|X), \qquad II = \sum_i E(L(\theta_i, \delta_i)1(j \in \mathcal{U}_p(t))|X).$$

According to Lemma 3.1,

$$I = \sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0, i \notin \mathcal{U}_p(t)) \leq L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

We only need to prove that $II \leq L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}$.

The remaining proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Ji and Jin (2012a). The difference lies in the extra parameter λ. We only sketch the main steps here. According to the proof of Lemma 2.3 of Ji and Jin (2012b), there exists a constant $K > 0$ and event A_p such that $P(A_p^c) \leq o(1/p^D)$ and that any subgraph of $\mathcal{U}_P(t)$ has at most K elements over the event A_p. We only need to show that $II \leq L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}$ over the event A_p. Following the similar argument of the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Ji and Jin (2012b), we only need to prove that

$$EL(\theta_i, \delta_i)1(i \in \mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p(t_p^*) \cap A_p \cap B_p) \leq L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

where B_p is defined through B_p^c as

$$B_p^c(\mathcal{I}_0) = \{\text{There are indices } i \notin \mathcal{I}_0 \text{ and } k \in \mathcal{I}_0 \text{ such that } \beta_i \neq 0, \Omega^*(i,k) \neq 0\}.$$

Now, we consider the type I error and type II error separately.

$$I^* = E1(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1)1(i \in \mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p(t_p^*) \cap A_p \cap B_p),$$

and

$$II^* = E1(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0)1(i \in \mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p(t_p^*) \cap A_p \cap B_p),$$

Let B_{nn} be the number of true negatives, B_{ns} be the number of false positives, B_{sn} be the number of false negatives, and B_{ss} be the number of true positives within $\mathcal{I}_0$. When considering the above type II error, then $B_{sn} + B_{ss} \geq 1$. Consequently,

$$II^* \leq L_p p^{-\vartheta(B_{sn}+B_{ss})}\bar{\Phi}(F).$$

where F is defined as the right hand side of (A.44) of Ji and Jin (2012b). It can be further similarly shown that when $B_{sn} + B_{ss} \geq 1$,

$$II^* \leq L_p p^{-\vartheta} p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}}.$$

Next consider type I error where

$$I^* \leq p^{-\vartheta(B_{sn}+B_{ss})}\bar{\Phi}(F).$$

When $B_{sn} + B_{ss} = 0$, then it was shown in Ji and Jin (2012b) that

$$I^* \leq L_p p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}}.$$

When $B_{sn} + B_{ss} \geq 1$, then

$$I^* \leq L_p p^{-\vartheta} p^{-\frac{(r-\vartheta+\zeta)^2}{4r}}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r} - \vartheta - \frac{(r-\vartheta+\zeta)^2}{4r} = -\zeta < 0.$$

Therefore,

$$I^* \leq L_p p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}}.$$

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned} & EL(\theta_i, \delta_i)1(i \in \mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p(t_p^*) \cap A_p \cap B_p) \\ \leq\ & p^{-\zeta} I^* + II^* \leq L_p \left[p^{-\zeta} p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}} + p^{-\vartheta} p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}} \right] \\ =\ & L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.1:
Note that

$$\begin{aligned} mFDR &= \frac{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1)}{\sum_i P(\delta_i = 1)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1)}{\sum_i [P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1) + P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 1)]}. \end{aligned}$$

In the denominator, note that

$$P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 1) = P(\theta_i = 1) - P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0) = p^{-\vartheta} - P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0).$$

According to Lemma 6.1,

$$\sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0) \leq Risk \leq L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 1) \geq p\left[p^{-\vartheta} - L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}\right] \geq p^{1-\vartheta}(1+o(1)).$$

Next, we consider the numerator $P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1)$. Note that

$$\lambda \sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1) \leq Risk = L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1) \leq L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}+\zeta} = L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}}.$$

Since $\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r} \geq \vartheta$, then

$$mFDR \leq L_p p^{-\frac{(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2}{4r}+\vartheta} = L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2-2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

Note that

$$m\text{FNR} = \frac{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0)}{\sum_i P(\delta_i = 0)} = \frac{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0)}{\sum_i [P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0) + P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 0)]}.$$

Note that

$$P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 0) = P(\theta_i = 0) - P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1) = \pi_0(1+o(1)).$$

Consider the numerator

$$\sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 0) \leq Risk \leq L_p p \cdot p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

Consequently,

$$m\text{FNR} \leq L_p p^{-\frac{r^2+(\vartheta-\zeta)^2+2r(\vartheta+\zeta)}{4r}}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.2.
According to the definition, we know that

$$m\text{FDR} = \frac{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1)}{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1) + \sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 1)}.$$

According to the proof of Theorem 3.1,

$$\sum_i P(\theta_i = 1, \delta_i = 1) \geq p^{1-\vartheta}(1+o(1)).$$

This leads to

$$mFDR \le \frac{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1)}{\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1) + p \cdot p^{-\vartheta}(1 + o(1))}. \tag{25}$$

Next, we consider the type I error $\sum_i P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1)$. By Lemma 3.2, there is a constant $K > 0$ and an event A_p such that $P(A_p^c) \le o(p^{-(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2/(4r)})$. Within A_p, similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Ji and Jin (2012b), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1, A_p) \\ &\le (2e \log p)^K \max_{\mathcal{I}_0}\{P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1, i \in \mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p(t_p^*), A_p)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where in the last equation $\mathcal{I}_0$ runs over all connected subgraphs of size $\ell \le K$ and containing i. For any $\mathcal{I}_0$ that is a component of $\mathcal{U}_p(t_1)$, denoted by $\mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p(t_1)$, there is an $|\mathcal{I}_0| \times 1$ vector $\tilde{z} \sim N(0, \Omega^{\mathcal{I}_0,\mathcal{I}_0})$ independent of $\beta^{\mathcal{I}_0}$ such that

$$\tilde{Y}^{\mathcal{I}_0} = \Omega^{\mathcal{I}_0,\mathcal{I}_0}\beta^{\mathcal{I}_0} + \tilde{z} + rem, \quad ||rem||_\infty \le o(1/\sqrt{\log p})$$

and eventually,

$$P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1, i \in \mathcal{I}_0 \lhd \mathcal{U}_p(t_1), A_p) \le p^{-\vartheta(B_{sn}+B_{ss})}\bar{\Phi}(G),$$

where

$$G = \frac{1}{2\tau_p\sqrt{\Delta_1'\Omega\Delta_1}}(-dt_2^{*2} + \tau_p^2\Delta_1'\Omega\Delta_1 + 2\tau_p^2\Delta_1'\Omega\Delta_2 + o(1/\sqrt{2\log p})),$$

where the last term is non-stochastic with a negligible effect. The difference between this and (A.42) in Ji and Jin (2012b) is that we require the error term to be smaller than $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log p}})$ to ensure the controlling of mFDR . This is guaranteed by threshold the sample covariance matrix Ω^* at $\frac{1}{\log^2 p}$.

Similar to the proof in Lemma 6.5 of Ji and Jin (2012b),

$$G \ge \frac{2(\vartheta - \zeta)\log p + 2r\log p + \frac{4r}{r+\vartheta-\zeta} \cdot \left[(K - \frac{1}{2})\log\log p - \log M\right]}{2\sqrt{2r\log p}}$$

By Mill's ratio,

$$\bar{\Phi}(G) \le \frac{(1 + o(1))\sqrt{2r\log p} \cdot p^{-(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2/(4r)} e^{(\frac{1}{2}-K)\log\log p - \log M}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(r + \vartheta - \zeta)\log p} \tag{27}$$

Combining with (26) gives

$$P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1, A_p) \le (1 + o(1))\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \cdot p^{-(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2/(4r)}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1) = P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1, A_p) + P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1, A_p^c) \\ \le\ & P(\theta_i = 0, \delta_i = 1, A_p) + o(p^{-(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2/(4r)}) \\ \le\ & (1 + o(1))\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \cdot p^{-(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2/(4r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (25) and $\zeta = (\sqrt{r} - \sqrt{\vartheta})^2$ gives

$$m\text{FDR} \le \frac{(1 + o(1))\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \cdot p^{-(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2/(4r)}}{(1 + o(1))\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \cdot p^{-(r+\vartheta-\zeta)^2/(4r)} + p^{-\vartheta}(1 + o(1))} = \alpha(1 + o(1)).$$

According to Theorem 3.1 and $\zeta = (\sqrt{r} - \sqrt{\theta})^2$, then

$$m\text{FNR} = L_p p^{-(\vartheta+(\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{\vartheta})^2)}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.3

First, we have the following lemma for estimating the tuning parameters t_2^* and t_3.

LEMMA 6.2. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.3, as $p \to \infty$ with probability $1 - o(1/p^D)$ with a constant $D > 0$, there is a nonrandom $g_p = o(1/\sqrt{\log p})$ such that*

$$|\hat{t}_2^* - t_2^*| \le g_p \quad \text{and} \quad |\hat{t}_3 - t_3| \le g_p.$$

Then

$$(1 - g_p)t_2^* \le \hat{t}_2^* \le (1 + g_p)t_2^*, \quad \text{and} \quad (1 - g_p)t_3 \le \hat{t}_3 \le (1 + g_p)t_3.$$

By a close investigation of the proof of Theorem 2.3, all the arguments for the mFDR still hold if we replace t_2^* by $(1 \pm g_p)t_2^*$ and t_3 by $(1 \pm g_p)t_3$. It is also the case for mFNR except that the generic log term L_p may be slightly different. Therefore, the proofs follow.

Proof of Lemma 6.2

The proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.4 in Ji and Jin (2012b), except that we need to choose

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_p &= 1/(\log p)^2,\\ a_p &= 1 + o(1/\sqrt{\log p}),\\ b_p &= o(1/\log p),\end{aligned}$$

and we need to control $\tilde{Y}$ with probability $1 + o(1/p^D)$ for sufficiently large $D > 0$. Then by similar techniques, we will have

$$||W - \tilde{Y}||_\infty \leq b_p\sqrt{2\log p}.$$

Introduce event $A_p = \{\|\tilde{Y} - W\|_\infty \leq b_p\sqrt{2\log(p)}\}$, and

$$\bar{F}_p^{\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p} 1_{\{W_j \pm b_p\sqrt{2\log p} \geq t\}}.$$

Comparing $\bar{F}_p^{\pm}(t)$ with $\bar{F}_p(t)$, it is seen that over the event A_p,

$$\bar{F}_p^{-}(t) \leq \bar{F}_p(t) \leq \bar{F}_p^{+}(t).$$

The claim follows from the following lemma, which is proved in Ji and Jin (2012b).

LEMMA 6.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.3, there is a constant $c = c(\vartheta, r) > 0$ such that, with probability $1 - o(1/p^D)$,*

$$\left|\frac{1}{p\epsilon_p}\sum_{j=1}^{p} 1_{\{W_j \geq t\}} - 1\right| \leq L_p p^{-c(\vartheta,r)}.$$

□

References.

BENJAMINI, Y. and HOCHBERG, Y. (1995). Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* **57** 289–300.

BENJAMINI, Y. and YEKUTIELI, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Annals of statistics* 1165–1188.

CAI, T. T., JIN, J. and LOW, M. G. (2007). Estimation and confidence sets for sparse normal mixtures. *The Annals of Statistics* **35** 2421–2449. MR2382653 (2009c:62058)

CANDS, E. J. and PLAN, Y. (2009). Near-ideal model selection by $\ell 1$ minimization. *The Annals of Statistics* **37** 2145–2177.

DONOHO, D. L. (2006). Compressed sensing. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **52** 1289–1306.

Donoho, D. and Jin, J. (2004). Higher criticism for detecting sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *Annals of Statistics* 962–994.

Donoho, D. and Jin, J. (2008). Higher criticism thresholding: Optimal feature selection when useful features are rare and weak. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105** 14790-14795.

Efron, B. (2008). Microarrays, empirical Bayes and the two-groups model. *Statistical Science* **23** 1–22.

Efron, B. (2010). *Large-Scale Inference: Empirical Bayes Methods for Estimation, Testing, and Prediction* **1**. Cambridge Univ Pr.

Fan, J., Han, X. and Gu, W. (2012). Estimating False Discovery Proportion Under Arbitrary Covariance Dependence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **107** 1019-1048. With discussion.

Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96** 1348–1360.

Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* **70** 849–911.

Genovese, C. and Wasserman, L. (2002). Operating Characteristics and Extensions of the False Discovery Rate Procedure. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* **64** 499–517.

Genovese, C. and Wasserman, L. (2004). A stochastic process approach to false discovery control. *The Annals of Statistics* **32** 1035–1061.

Genovese, C. R., Jin, J., Wasserman, L. and Yao, Z. (2012). A comparison of the lasso and marginal regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **13** 2107–2143.

Hall, P. and Jin, J. (2008). Properties of higher criticism under strong dependence. *The Annals of Statistics* **36** 381–402.

Hall, P. and Jin, J. (2010). Innovated higher criticism for detecting sparse signals in correlated noise. *The Annals of Statistics* **38** 1686–1732.

He, L., Sarkar, S. K. and Zhao, Z. (2013). Capturing the Severity of Type II errors in High-Dimensional Multiple Testing. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*. Submitted.

Ingster, Y. I., Pouet, C. and Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). Classification of sparse high-dimensional vectors. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **367** 4427-4448.

Jager, L. and Wellner, J. A. (2007). Goodness-of-fit tests via phi-divergences. *The Annals of Statistics* **35** 2018–2053.

Ji, P. and Jin, J. (2012a). UPS delivers optimal phase diagram in high-dimensional variable selection. *The Annals of Statistics* **40** 73–103.

Ji, P. and Jin, J. (2012b). Supplement to "UPS delivers optimal phase diagram in high dimensional variable selection".

Jin, J. (2009). Impossibility of successful classification when useful features are rare and weak. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **106** 8859-8864.

Jin, J. (2012). Comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **107** 1042-1045.

Jin, J. (2014). Rare and weak effects in large-scale inference: methods and phase diagrams. *Manuscript*.

Jin, J. and Ke, T. (2014). Discussion on "Multi-scale change-point inference". *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **76**.

Jin, J., Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, Q. (2012). Optimality of Graphlet Screening in high dimensional variable selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.6452*.

Ke, T., Jin, J. and Fan, J. (2012). Covariance Assisted Screening and Estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.4645*.

Li, R., Zhong, W. and Zhu, L. (2012). Feature Screening via Distance Correlation Learn-

ing. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1129-1139.
Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2006). High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics* 1436–1462.
Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2010). Stability selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **72** 417–473.
Sarkar, S. K. (2002). Some results on false discovery rate in stepwise multiple testing procedures. *Annals of Statistics* 239–257.
Sarkar, S. K. and Zhou, T. (2008). Controlling Bayes directional false discovery rate in random effects model. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **138** 682–693.
Sun, W. and Cai, T. T. (2007). Oracle and adaptive compound decision rules for false discovery rate control. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **102** 901–912.
Sun, W. and Cai, T. T. (2009). Large-scale multiple testing under dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* **71** 393–424.
Xie, J., Cai, T. T., Maris, J. and Li, H. (2011). Optimal False Discovery Rate Control for Dependent Data. *Statistics and Its Interface* **4** 417-430.
Zhang, C. and Zhang, S. (2014). Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **76** 217–242.
Zhao, P. and Yu, B. (2006). On model selection consistency of Lasso. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **7** 2541–2563.
Zou, H. (2006). The adaptive Lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **101** 1418–1429.

Pengsheng Ji
Department of Statistics
University of Georgia
101 Cedar St.
Athens, GEORGIA 30602
USA
E-mail: psji@uga.edu

Zhigen Zhao
Department of Statistics
Temple University
346 Speakman Hall
1810 N. 13th Street
Philadelphia, PENNSYLVANIA, 19122
USA
E-mail: zhaozhg@temple.edu